

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appl. No. : 10/015,958 Confirmation No. 6989  
Appellants : David George De Vorchik *et al.*  
Filed : October 30, 2001  
Group Art Unit: 2192  
Examiner : Eric B. Kiss  
Title : METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR CHAINING AND EXTENDING  
WIZARDS  
Docket No. : 164122.01/MFCP.88142  
Customer No. : 45809

**EFS – 25 August 2008**

**APPELLANTS' REPLY BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P. O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This is a Reply Brief in response to an Examiner's Answer mailed 23 June 2008. These claims have been at least twice rejected. Appellants do hereby submit this Reply Brief under 37 C.F.R. §41.41(b)(2). The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fee that may be due, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

---

## Contents

I.	Status of Claims .....	3
II.	Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal.....	4
III.	Argument .....	5
A)	Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Fedorov et al. (Professional Active Server Pages 2.0,) 1998, Wrox Press Ltd) .....	5
(i)	Claims 7, 10, and 11.....	5
B)	Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Gauthier <i>et al</i> (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,791). .....	8
(i)	Claims 1, 8, and 9.....	8
(ii)	Claim 14.....	9

**I. STATUS OF CLAIMS**

Claims 1-3, 7-11, 14, 16, and 18-19 are rejected and pending, and the rejection of each of those claims is being appealed. Claims 4-6, 12, 13, 15, 17, and 20 are canceled.

## **II. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL**

A) Whether claims 7, 10, and 11 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) by Fedorov et al. (Professional Active Server Pages 2.0," 1998, Wrox Press Ltd).

B) Whether claims 1-3, 8, 9, and 14 are anticipated under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by Gauthier *et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,791).

### III. ARGUMENT

The Office has included at least three additional arguments in the 23 June 2008 Examiner's Answers to shore up the original grounds of rejection maintained in the 05 December 2006 Final Office Action. In summary, the Office's additional arguments are: seismic.asp and equakeget.htm are wizards; a send button of equakeget.htm enables recursive navigation between equakeget.htm and seismic.asp; and subwizards must be given control to execute in the target wizard.

Appellant addresses the additional explanations in the remarks that follow. Appellant concludes that the prior art, including Fedorov and Gauthier, fails to anticipate the invention of independent claims 1, 7-11, and 14 because the prior art fails to expressly or inherently teach or describe all elements of independent claims 1, 7-11, and 14.

#### **A) Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Fedorov et al. (Professional Active Server Pages 2.0,) 1998, Wrox Press Ltd)**

##### **(i) Claims 7, 10, and 11**

In the specification, at p. 2, ll. 7-10, Appellants define "wizard." In the Examiner's Answer, the Office addresses Appellant's definition of the term "wizard" as recited in Appellant's specification. However, the Office's emphasis is misplaced because independent claims 7, 10, and 11 do not merely require a wizard. Rather, independent claims 7, 10, and 11 require, among other things, extending a wizard by generating a host wizard that defines an extension interface that integrates a web component into the host wizard and enables recursive navigation between the web component and the host wizard.

The Office concludes that seismic.asp is a host wizard and equakeget.htm is a web component. As Fedorov explains, at pg. 433, seismic.asp performs server side calculations.

Seismic.asp is a server-side process that checks the URL entered by the user to determine if appropriate values are provided in the URL. When the URL is lacking values for specific parameters, the wizard dialog (equakeget.htm) is loaded to collect the values for the missing parameters. Fedorov expressly teaches a Seismic load calculator is composed of the user interface provided by equakeget.htm and the server-side calculations provided by seismic.asp. Fedorov does not describe seismic.asp as the wizard. Seismic.asp executes on the server to return the results of the calculations performed by seismic.asp to the user. The values retrieved from the user via the wizard dialog box are validated by a JavaScript function provided by seismic.asp.

Further, seismic.asp is not a wizard that defines an extension interface to respond to navigation events, where the extension interface enables recursive navigation between the host-wizard and a web component. Seismic.asp is not a multistep process that provides recursive navigation between a host wizard and a web component that extends the host wizard. Rather, seismic.asp merely loads a wizard dialog box that collects data, closes the wizard dialog box after data collection, and receives and processes the collected data on the server executing seismic.asp.

The Office's conclusion that a user interface which integrates a web component into a host wizard by utilizing the extension interface to perform recursive navigation between the web component and host wizard as recited in independent claims 7, 10, and 11 is anticipated by an html page (equakeget.htm) and an active server pager (ASP) page (seismic.asp) as in Fedorov is unreasonable. *See, e.g.*, Examiner's Answer mailed 23 June 2008 at pp. 9-10. Fedorov, at p., 431, ll. 11-15, teaches the wizard dialog closes when the user clicks the send

button. Thus, closing the wizard dialog box does not provide recursive navigation between the wizard dialog and the host wizard. If the wizard dialog box is closed recursive navigation would be impossible.

Recursive navigation allows forward and backward navigation between both the host wizard and the web component. Fedorov, expressly explains that seismic.asp receives the values entered by the user in the dialog box only after the wizard dialog box is closed. The operations performed by the Fedorov's Seismic calculator do not provide recursive navigation between equakget.htm and seismic.asp because equakeget.htm closes and seismic.asp fails to provide the ability to return the panels of equakeget.htm after the "Send" button is depressed by the user.

Moreover, as Fedorov explains, at p. 427, the Seismic calculator is a simple active server page that leverages dynamic html and forms tag to create the wizard. The seismic.asp page loads the HTML code for the wizard dialog box. Seismic.asp does not provide recursive navigation between the wizard dialog box and a host-wizard to provide an extended wizard.

Unlike Fedorov, the invention of independent claims 7, 10, and 11, require, among other things, a host-wizard that defines an extension interface that responds to navigation events to provide recursive navigation between a web component and the host wizard. Fedorov fails to teach a host wizard and integration of the host wizard and a web component in a manner that provides recursive navigation between the host wizard and the web component when generating the user interface. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Appellant respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of independent claims 7, 10, and 11.

**B) Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Gauthier *et al* (U.S. Patent No. 6,574,791).**

**(i) Claims 1, 8, and 9**

With respect to independent claims 1, 8, and 9, Gauthier fails to teach, among other things, “invoking said one or more sub-wizard components during said host-wizard component execution; and transferring control from said host-wizard to said one or more sub-wizard components.”

The Office contends that the functionality of the subwizard is defined within the subwizard and control must be passed to the subwizard during execution to realize the described functionality. Moreover, the office contends that “in object-oriented technology, calling a method (such as get and set methods defined within the subwizard WizardState object) during execution of a program requires devoting processor resources to such method code, thus passing control to the executable code in such method. If this were not the case, the executable subwizards of Gauthier *et al.*, would never be executed, and their functionality never realized as part of an operable system.”

Contrary to the Office's assertions, the existence of a subwizard does not ensure the execution of the subwizard. Gauthier, at col. 9, ll. 56-58 and col. 13, ll. 25-35, explains a “WizardManager” controls the execution of the subwizards which define the Target wizard. The Target wizard allows the addition and deletion of subwizards.

Moreover Gauthier, at col. 13, ll. 48-53, explains the WizardManager object controls execution of the one or more subwizards that make up the target wizard. Gauthier notes, at cols. 10-11, that classes are configured with a “describes content method” used to export metadata from class objects. Accordingly, to maintain consistent styles and access scopes



provided to the subwizards, col. 12, ll. 30-40 and col. 13, ll. 49-50, the framework corresponding to target wizard retains control and implements the definitions associated with the subwizard via the “describes content method” to provide the corresponding subwizard functionality.

Gauthier, at col. 7, ll. 5-15, further explains that target wizards are built by a developer using a WizardDesigner. Nothing in Gauthier requires the execution of a subwizard. Instead Gauthier describes building framework-compliant wizards.

Unlike Gauthier, independent claims 1, 8, and 9 require, among other things, a host-wizard to transfer control directly to a sub-wizard, and the sub-wizard to control its own execution. Gauthier fails to teach a transfer of control to one or more sub-wizard components. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Appellants respectfully request withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of independent claims 1, 8, and 9.

(ii) Claim 14

With respect to independent claim 14, Gauthier fails to teach, among other things, “at least one navigation component on each of said first and second wizards, said navigation components allowing sequential progression or regression through said first and second wizards to chain said second wizard to said first wizard to guide a user through the first and second tasks.”

The Office contends, among other things, that Gauthier describes hierarchical control between the target wizard and subwizards and use of GUI panels to allow the user to select one of the subwizards for execution, thus navigating between the host wizard and the subwizard.

As discussed above, Gauthier describes creating a target wizard. Gauthier, at col. 14, ll. 4-9, explains that functionality of the target wizard is varied via selection received at the WizardManagerSelectionPanel object. However, selection of target wizard functionality does not navigate between two wizards. The navigation control described in Gauthier is limited to panels within the target wizard.

Unlike Gauthier, independent claim 14 requires, among other things, at least one navigation component on each of said first and second wizards, said navigation components allowing sequential progression or regression through said first and second wizards to chain said second wizard to said first wizard to guide a user through the first and second tasks. Gauthier fails to teach navigation components on each wizard that allow sequential progression or regression through said first and second wizards to chain said second wizard to said first wizard to guide a user through the first and second tasks. Therefore, for at least the above reasons, Appellants respectfully request withdrawal of the anticipation rejection and allowance of independent claim 14.

**CONCLUSION**

Appellants respectfully submit that claims 1-3, 7-11, 14, 16, and 18-19 are in condition for allowance. As such, Appellants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims be reversed and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should there be any unresolved matters, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 25 August 2008

/MONPLAISIR HAMILTON/

---

Monplaisir Hamilton  
Reg. No. 54,851

SHOOK, HARDY, & BACON L.L.P.  
2555 Grand Blvd.  
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613  
Tel.: 816/474-6550  
Fax: 816/421-5547  
Attorney Docket No. MFCP.88142